DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 745 EA 008 298

AUTHOR Nasstrom, Roy R., Jr.
TITLE Militancy and Leadership in the National Education Association, 1959-1969.
PUB DATE Feb 70
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association (San Francisco, February 1970) Parts of text may be marginally legible due to marginal print quality of original

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Comparative Analysis; Governing Boards; *Leadership; Organizational Change; *Participation; Policy Formation; Political Power; *Professional Associations; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Militancy; *Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *National Education Association; NEA

ABSTRACT

Critics of the National Education Association (NEA) have often charged that it has been dominated by school and college administrators and, therefore, has failed to reflect adequately the views of teachers, who constitute the vast majority of its membership. However, the growing militance of the NEA during the 1960's would make paradoxical the continuance of administrators in influential leadership positions. Consequently, several major constituent bodies of the association were investigated from 1959 to 1970. The study has sought to discover whether--and if so, when, why, and to what extent--the composition of these bodies reflected a change in the number of administrators, in the number of nonadministrative professional school personnel, and in the number of teachers alone. The study reports the exact number of school administrators and classroom teachers in positions of authority in the NEA during the period of the organization's major ideological transformation. It clearly shows the decline of administrators' dominance and the attitudes of the majority of members toward such dominance. (Author/MLF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123745

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

MILITANCY AND LEADERSHIP IN THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, 1959-1969

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Roy R. Nasstrom, Jr.

College of Education

University of Kentucky

Lexington, Kentucky

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the California Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, February, 1970

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 008 298

R. Nasstrom
University of Kentucky

Critics of the National Education Association have often charged that it has been dominated by school and college administrators and therefore has failed to reflect adequately the views of teachers, who constitute the vast majority of its membership.[1] Charges of domination by administrators have rested on several bases. Frequently cited as examples of such domination have been the ostensible mildness of organizational policy on issues involving teacher autonomy and the evidence of pressure exerted by school administrators upon teachers to join.[2] Perhaps the most important single empirical measure of control by a particular group in a voluntary organization, however, is the number of leadership positions held by that group. According to a study of the structure of the NEA during the 1920s, administrators held an overwhelming number of these positions; classroom teachers comprised only 6.3 per cent of the membership of committees and commissions.[3] Despite the lack of systematic investigation of the occupancy of leadership positions during later periods, the belief has persisted that administrators hold major offices. For example, an important study of local teacher groups published in 1969 has reported that the NEA welcomes administrators and places them in top leadership positions.[4]

But does it? The growing militancy of the NEA

during the 1960s would make paradoxical the continuance of administrators in influential leadership positions. The NEA has given its enthusiastic support first to sanctions and then to strikes. It has enlarged the scope of its goals in collective negotiations. It has expanded its organizing efforts. By the end of the 1960s, its policies had diverged sharply from those of organizations of school administrators. Relations with the American Association of School Administrators had approached severance, despite the NEA's official adherence to the tenet that "all educators, regardless of position, rank, or authority, are engaged in a common cause."

The policy cleavage between the NEA and organizations of administrators suggests an examination of leadership positions in the NEA during recent years. Consequently, investigation has been made of several major constituent bodies of the Association from 1959 to 1970. The study has sought to discover whether ---and if so, when, why, and to what extent --- the composition of these bodies reflected a change in the number of administrators; in the number of non-administrative professional school personnel, including teachers, who are subject to the authority of administrators; and in the number of teachers alone. The study has excluded consideration of staff employees of the NEA, but it has considered staff officials of state education associations serving on NEA units on the same

basis as members who are employed by educational institutions.

Basic information has been supplied by the Handbooks and the Addresses and Proceedings of the NEA. These sources have been supplemented and sometimes corrected with data secured from interviews. Investigation has been limited to units involved for several years in the initiation, study, dissemination, and implementation of policies concerning either the allocation of resources for education or the autonomy and responsibilities of educators. Those units which have been investigated include the Representative Assembly, the Board of Directors (from 1964), the Executive Committee, the Board of Trustees, the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, the Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities (from 1961), the Legislative Commission, and standing committees on Professional Ethics, Educational Finance, and Citizenship.

At certain levels in the school hierarchy the distinction between administrators and non-administrators is hazy. In this study the term "administrator" refers to an individual in a college or a school whose responsibilities include supervisory and evaluative authority over other staff members without likelihood of nullification of such authority by higher officials.[5] Within the public school system, the term refers specifically to principals,

vice-principals, deans, district-wide coordinators, district-wide directors, supervisors, and incumbents of any other offices qualifying the individual for membership in any professional organization of administrators in education.[6] Comparable definitions apply to positions in higher education. The term "non-administrator" encompasses not only teachers, but also counselors, specialists, nurses, librarians, and consultants; these people are increasingly equated with teachers within the educational hierarchy.[7] When the term "teacher" is used, it refers to an individual who teaches any of grades K through 14 or a college professor. Department heads in both public schools and in colleges may have supervisory and evaluative authority, but they ordinarily seem not to exercise such authority, and therefore they have been considered "teachers," and hence "non-administrators."[8] Although the terms "administrator," "non-administrator," and "teacher" refer to individuals at all levels of education, the vast majority of individuals noted are employed in the public schools. Staff officials of state teacher organizations are identified separately from administrators, non-administrators, and teachers.

The Representative Assembly[9]

The Representative Assembly is the governing body of the NEA. It consists almost entirely of delegates from affiliated state and local associations, although a minute proportion of its membership is made up of important NEA officials. Its delegates, who have numbered between 5,000 and 7,000 during the period 1959-1969, meet every summer, passing resolutions establishing NEA policies and electing the President, the Treasurer, and four members of the Executive Committee. The enormous size of the Assembly has evoked charges of unwieldiness and inefficiency, but attempts at reduction have been unsuccessful.

As indicated in Table 1, from 1959 to 1969, the non-administrators in the Assembly rose from 70 per cent of delegates (teachers alone, 68 per cent) to 79 per cent (teachers, 74 per cent). Administrators declined from 25 per cent to 15 per cent. Change occurred most rapidly during the latter part of the period. It is of interest to note that even in 1959 teachers had higher representation than they had three decades earlier; in 1928 they comprised 57 per cent of delegates.[10]

Insert Table 1 about here

The Board of Directors

Not until 1964 was enough occupational information available to permit thorough investigation of this body. The Board, which meets during the summer prior to and during the meeting of the Representative Assembly and ordinarily also for a few days in the fall and the winter, consists of approximately ninety delegates elected to three-year terms ---since 1967 no more than three in succession--- by the highly autonomous state affiliates, the Puerto Rico Teachers Association, the Overseas Education Association, and the District of Columbia Education Association. Certain NEA officers are also members. The Board is charged with determining general NEA policies and "major interests" between the annual meetings of the Representative Assembly.

Table 2 indicates that, in 1964-65, administrators comprised 53 per cent of Board members, and non-administrators comprised 41 per cent. In 1969-70, administrators had fallen to 34 per cent of members, and non-administrators had risen to 62 per cent. Teachers themselves, exclusive of other non-administrators, had risen from 35 per cent in 1964-65 to 52 per cent in 1969-70. Administrators had remained the largest single group on the Board until 1968-69, with mean representation of 52 per cent between 1964-65 and 1967-68, in comparison with 39 per cent for non-administrators and 35 per cent for teachers alone. Non-administrators achieved heavier representation than administrators

for the first time in 1968-69, the year after a three-term limitation had been voted by the Representative Assembly.

Insert Table 2 about here

The Executive Committee

Between meetings of the Board of Directors, the Executive Committee has responsibility for the general policies and interests of the NEA. Before 1969-70, the Committee consisted of eleven members, but since the elimination of the Board of Trustees, whose chairman was an ex officio member, ten people serve on the Committee. Two are elected by the Board of Directors and four are elected by the Representative Assembly; the other members are the President, Vice-President, Immediate Past President, and Treasurer of the NEA. Terms of elected members are for two years, and since 1967-68, they have been prohibited from holding office for more than three terms. Until the mid-1960s, the Committee met only three times a year, at approximately the same time as the Board of Directors, but since 1967 it has met six or seven times a year. The Committee has specific responsibilities for admitting, expelling, and reinstating members and affiliate organizations; for establishing the time and place of the annual meeting of the NEA; for exercising certain fiscal powers; for selecting certain members of the commissions and councils of the NEA; and generally for filling

vacancies in various offices, commissions, councils, and special committees. Since the summer of 1967, the Committee has had the responsibility of appointing and determining the pay of the Executive Secretary of the NEA.

As indicated in Table 3, in 1959-60, administrators held six of eleven seats and non-administrators, all of whom were teachers, held four. In 1969-70, administrators held three seats and non-administrators, all but one of whom were teachers, held five. Administrators, ordinarily one or two of whom were affiliated with colleges, held a majority of seats on the Committee through 1964-65; non-administrators attained a majority in 1965-66, slipped back to equality with administrators in 1966-67, and regained majority status in 1967-68.

Insert Table 3 about here

Board of Trustees

Eliminated in June 1969, this unit had charge of permanent funds of the NEA, supervised and managed the NEA headquarters building, and until 1967 selected the Executive Secretary. The Board included the President of the NEA and four members elected to four-year terms by the Board of Directors. For virtually the entire period of this study, administrators and former administrators held a majority of seats on the Board. Although non-administrators would appear to have outnumbered administrators in 1964-65 and 1965-66,

it must be noted that a member described as a "consultant" from 1962-63 to 1965-66 was a retired college president who could realistically be designated an administrator (See Table 4). Thus for practical purposes the majority status of administrators did not end until 1967-68. By this time, when three teachers held seats, the power of the Board was ending.

Insert Table 4 about here

The Commissions

Commissions operate in wide areas of general interest under the general supervision of the Executive Committee. They conduct investigations, develop policies, recommend standards, and promulgate information to the profession and to the public. Although they operate under the general policies of the NEA, they have been reported to be relatively autonomous in developing their own programs.[11] Each commission has an executive secretary and a professional staff at NEA headquarters. Exclusive of NEA staff members, the commissions have from nine to thirteen members, appointed to three or four year terms by the Executive Committee. Considered here are the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, the Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, and the Legislative Commission.

From 1961-62, the first year in which all these commissions existed, to 1969-70, the proportion of administrators serving fell from 48 per cent to 15 per cent of members. On the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (Table 5), administrators dropped from six of nine members in 1959-60 to one of nine in 1969-70. Administrators fell from majority status for the first time in 1964-65, lost it finally in 1966-67, and began a rapid decline in 1968-69. On the Legislative Commission (Table 6), administrators dropped from 60 per cent of members in 1959-60 to 18 per cent in 1969-70; they first lost their majority status in 1964-65, and in 1967-68 they fell behind non-administrators for the first time. Administrators never held a majority of seats on the Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities (Table 7), but for several years they had substantial representation; they declined precipitously in 1967-68.

Insert Tables 5, 6, and 7 about here

The Standing Committees

Standing committees carry on "continuous programs of study, interpretation and action" in various fields. Although committees have NEA "contacts" and national advisory groups, they do not have the large staffs or, ordinarily, the extensive responsibilities of the commissions. Currently, each consists of five members appointed by the

NEA President to five year terms, since 1963 without right of succession. Appointments to the Committee on Professional Ethics must be approved by the Executive Committee. The standing committees dealt with in this study, all of which have been in existence for the entire period, are those on Professional Ethics, Educational Finance, and Citizenship. The Committee on Professional Ethics has given its major attention to the development and implementation of the NEA Code of Ethics and the strengthening of "professional rights." The Committee on Educational Finance sponsors, conducts, and disseminates research in finance for the public and for the profession. During the first part of the period under study the Committee on Citizenship did little more than stimulate the practice of "worthy citizenship"; now, however, it works to involve teachers in politics in order to influence educational policy.

On none of the standing committees is any trend evident. On the Committee on Professional Ethics (Table 8), non-administrators outnumbered administrators four to one in 1959-60 and three to one in 1969-70. On the Committee on Educational Finance (Table 9), administrators in 1969-70 equalled non-administrators, as they had several times previously, beginning in 1961-62. They had surpassed non-administrators in 1959-60, 1960-61, 1964-65, and 1965-66. Similarly, on the Committee on Citizenship (Table 10),

no major shifts have been apparent. One or two administrators have served each year during the entire period, and non-administrators have made up the balance. Only one administrator was represented in the period 1959-60 to 1961-62, in 1965-66, and from 1967-68 on.

Insert Tables 8, 9, and 10 about here

A Glance at Some Causes of Administrator Decline

In most of the agencies investigated, the number of administrators has declined considerably, especially during the past two or three years.[12] Only on the standing committees, bodies of less importance than the others, has there been no significant change during the period under study, but on two of these committees administrators never evidenced much strength.

Following the gains made by the American Federation of Teachers in New York City in 1962, many members of the NEA expressed their unhappiness with administrators. In 1965 this unhappiness erupted in the Representative Assembly. In the context of resolving approval of "professional negotiations," the Assembly noted that the "school board, superintendent or administrator, and the teaching staff may make significantly different contributions to education."[13] This was the first time that different responsibilities of teachers and administrators were emphasized in a resolution.

The Assembly also tied sanctions to the Code of Ethics and resolved that the offering or accepting of positions in a sanctioned district should be construed as a violation of the Code.[14] Backers of this resolution contended that as long as superintendents belonged to the NEA, they should be required to adhere to the Code, regardless of state legal requirements concerning the superintendent's relationship to the board of education.[15]

Delegates also expressed dismay over a lack of classroom teacher representation on important committees of the NEA, and they directly hit administrators by approving two Bylaw amendments and a resolution.

The Bylaw amendments had been proposed the previous year by petition of delegates of the Akron, Ohio, Education Association, and they were modified for technical reasons on the floor at the 1965 meeting. They required that a specific number of appointed members of the Executive Committee and the Board of Trustees be classroom teachers.[16] With regard to the Executive Committee, of the two members elected by and from the Board of Directors, at least one was to be a classroom teacher, and of the four members elected by the Representative Assembly, at least two more were to be classroom teachers. With regard to the Board of Trustees, at least two of the four members

elected by the Board of Directors were to be classroom teachers.

Proponents of the measures pointed out that not once from 1950 to 1964 had the Board of Directors elected a teacher to the Board of Trustees,[17] and that since 1950 the Board of Directors had elected no teachers to the Executive Committee.[18] Among reasons given for the amendments were the importance of the NEA's competing effectively with the American Federation of Teachers (never mentioned specifically by name),[19] the need for close association between teachers and administrators,[20] and the increased education and ability of classroom teachers.[21] In response to a suggestion that the proposed changes be postponed until after the completion of a "thoroughgoing structural study" of the Association, delegates were negative, noting that no more time should be wasted[22] and that some doubt existed concerning the likelihood that leaders of the NEA would give further attention to "the importance of classroom teacher representation on important committees of the NEA."[23]

After the passage of the Bylaw amendments, the following resolution was approved:

> In selecting persons to serve on the appointive boards, committees and commissions of the National Education Association, the Executive Committee should move to raise classroom teacher representation as rapidly as practicable to majority status on all such appointive agencies which are intended to be generally representative of the interests of teachers.[24]

Several delegates spoke in favor of this resolution. To the charge that it would cause divisiveness, one speaker asserted, "We are going before the school boards of the nation and asking that the classroom teachers be given opportunities to participate fully in the formation of school policies. We should ask no less in the National Education Association."[25] The President of the Department of Classroom Teachers commented that she believed in a united profession, but she added:

> ...it seems rather peculiar to me at times that when classroom teachers speak for representation in places where we have little voice, it is called divisiveness. When others speak of this kind of representation it is spoken of as strength.[26]

Implementation of this resolution came too slowly for the majority of delegates attending the Representative Assembly in 1967. Despite the Executive Secretary's contention that the resolution had been implemented "very substantially,"[27] the Assembly deleted the clause "as rapidly as practicable," because, as several delegates said, the intent of the original motion had not been achieved. "Who is to determine the length of time?" asked one delegate.[28] Another remarked, "Let's quit horsing around with the Mickey Mouse. You want your organization to be led by you..."[29] Claims that appointments should be made on the basis of special knowledge without regard to educational position were ignored or derided, and the delegates even added a sentence to the resolution which

urged local and state associations to implement the same policy in their own areas.[30] The delegates also brought into the open the apparently long festering belief that the Representative Assembly, despite its nominal power, had been treated as little more than an agency of legitimacy for smaller, more exclusive bodies. The following resolution was passed:

> The Representative Assembly of the National Education Association hereby reaffirms its role as the policy-making body designated by the Charter and By-laws and hereby reminds all executive units of the Association that their basic responsibility is to implement the policy and directives of the membership as expressed through the Representative Assembly.
>
> It further admonishes all the executive units of the NEA to be sensitive to the direction of the Representative Assembly and to carry out its directives.[31]

Two years after this resolution was approved, the Assembly again indicated dissatisfaction with the pace of administrator decline, despite the smaller representation of administrators on many bodies. Delegates approved an amendment to the resolution on unit classroom teacher membership, replacing the term "majority status" with "at least 75 per cent" in reference to teacher membership.[32] The delegate proposing the amendment said, "We are moving toward one man, one vote, and that is what this motion aims at."[33] One of the supporters of the amendment stated:

> In the past we have heard the argument that NEA must have the best qualified people as members of the NEA boards, committees, and commissions. It would seem to me that if we do not pass this amendment, we are saying

> as classroom teachers that we are not competent to make recommendations and decisions which directly affect us. It is time that teachers take their fair share of the control of this organization.[34]

Concluding Remarks

By the early 1960s, administrators held fewer positions of leadership in the NEA than they had in the 1920s, but they still held majorities on the most important units other than the Representative Assembly. Their sharp decline in the late 1960s was clearly not merely a continuance of a long-term trend; it was the result of direct action by the Representative Assembly during the past few years.

Within the Representative Assembly itself, the decline of administrators as delegates reflected, it would seem, the increasing militancy among teachers and their growing belief that hierarchical differences within public education implied differences in interests and goals. The decline of administrators on the Board of Directors may be attributed to the same reason, although the suddenness of the decline between 1967-68 and 1968-69 was a reflection of a new three-term limitation for directors. The changing attitude in state associations, which use various procedures in selecting their directors, is especially noteworthy since these associations have considerable autonomy within the NEA,[35] and they deal directly with the source of

so much of the financial and professional desiderata of education, the state legislatures.[36]

Even before the decline of administrators in NEA, militancy among members was growing. In view of this growth, how did administrators retain as many positions as they did? Their persistence in office is perhaps not really surprising. In almost all professional organizations those people with positions of relatively high prestige and authority within the occupation itself hold most leadership offices, and within the NEA, well into the 1960s, such people were school and college administrators.[37] Moreover, the flexible nature of their work allowed administrators, in contrast to teachers, greater latitude in giving effort to extra-school activities. Administrators, too, frequently had greater expertise in particular areas of education considered important by the NEA, such as school finance.

The possibility that these factors might continue to exercise influence upon teachers was undoubtedly in the minds of many delegates to the Representative Assembly when they chose to use structural devices rather than to await direct action by the Assembly in order to limit the number of administrators selected to serve on the Executive Committee by the Representative Assembly itself.

A question of some importance concerns the relationship

of incumbent administrators to the growing militancy of the NEA. The policies of organizations of administrators would suggest that most administrators in the NEA have had serious reservations about the trend of NEA policies. It would appear, however, that administrators holding important posts in the NEA had little choice but to follow the policies of the organization. Regardless of oligarchical characteristics of most organizations, leaders cannot remain secure in their positions for long if they fail to satisfy the wishes of members.[38] A failure to provide such satisfaction in the NEA could have resulted in the expulsion of all administrators from the organization, thereby eliminating even their slightest influence. Consequently, despite the anti-administrator thrust of NEA policies, administrators had substantial reasons for holding on to their positions as long as possible in the organization which represented such a large segment of the educational profession and had such great potential influence over future educational policy in the United States.

Although administrators still hold some important positions in the NEA, it is evident that their day of leadership is in its twilight. Even if they remain in the NEA in the future, which is by no means certain, they will play subordinate roles.

*****

NOTES

[1]It has been estimated that approximately 90 per cent of the members of the National Education Association could be placed in the rather nebulous category of "classroom teachers." Cf. T. M. Stinnett, Turmoil in Teaching (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 219; and National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings, 1965 (Washington: The Association, 1965), p. 123. Within American education as a whole, administrators, however loosely defined, have comprised less than 10 per cent of professional personnel. Cf. National Education Association, Estimates of School Statistics, 1961-62: Research Report 1961-R 22 (Washington: The Association, 1962), pp. 10, 19, 22-23; National Education Association, Estimates of School Statistics 1969-70: Research Report 1969-R 15 (Washington: The Association, 1970), pp. 2, 12-13; and "The Magnitude of the American Educational Establishment," Saturday Review, November 16, 1968, p. 105.

[2]Cf. Myron Lieberman and Michael H. Moskow, Collective Negotiations for Teachers (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966), pp. 169-174.

[3]Erwin S. Selle, The Organization and Activities of the National Education Association (New York: Division of Publications, Columbia University, 1932), p. 61.

[4]Alan Rosenthal, Pedagogues and Power (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1969), p. 11.

[5]Cf. Peter M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964), p. 117; and Association of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association, Constitution and Bylaws and Proposed Amendments --- Titles, Texts, and Analyses (Washington: The Association of Classroom Teachers, 1969), pp. 12-13.

[6]Cf. Association of Classroom Teachers, ibid., p. 13.

[7]People in these positions are accepted under the "allied work" clause in the Constitution of the Association of Classroom Teachers. Information obtained in correspondence with Miss Margaret Stevenson, Executive Secretary, Association of Classroom Teachers.

[8]In higher education, roles of department chairmen vary considerably, but the American Association of University Professors does not consider department chairmen to be administrators. The department chairman in public schools seems to be considered a teacher. For example, in 1965-66, fifty-eight per cent of affiliates of the American Federation of Teachers enrolled department chairmen, although only 18 percent enrolled principals (no longer eligible) and only 20 percent enrolled vice-principals. P. Schnaufer, Report on Supervisory Membership in AFT and Other International Unions (Chicago: The American Federation of Teachers, 1965).

[9]Basic structural information on the units is derived from: National Education Association, Handbooks, 1959-60 to 1969-70 (Washington: The Association, 1959-1969); National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings, 1959 to 1969 (Washington: The Association, 1959 to 1969); and T. M. Stinnett, Turmoil in Teaching (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968).

[10]Selle, op. cit., p. 62.

[11]Stinnett, op. cit., p. 214.

[12]Not until 1969 did one teacher succeed another as president. During the period of the study, six administrators, one of whom was a college administrator, and four teachers, one of whom was a college teacher, served as president.

[13]National Education Association, Addresses and Proceedings, 1965, p. 415.

[14]Ibid., p. 416.

[15]Ibid., pp. 169-170. As a result of complaints by administrators, loopholes were introduced in later years.

[16]Ibid., pp. 118-126. No definition of the term "classroom teacher" was given. Ibid., p. 128.

[17]Ibid., p. 124. One speaker stated that classroom teachers "have had no representation on the Board of Trustees" from 1947 to 1964. Actually, in ex officio status, as presidents of the NEA, both college and public school teachers served on the Board for one-year terms.

[18]Ibid., pp. 122, 124.

[19]Ibid., pp. 120-121.

[20]Ibid., p. 123.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid., pp. 120-121.

[23]Ibid., p. 121.

[24]Ibid., p. 415; cf. pp. 180-187.

[25]Ibid., p. 183.

[26]Ibid.

[27]NEA, Addresses and Proceedings, 1967, p. 223.

[28]Ibid., p. 222.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., p. 504; cf. pp. 235-236.

[32]NEA, Addresses and Proceedings, 1969, p. 267.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid.

[35]With regard to state organizational autonomy, see "NEA Influence over State Local Affiliates in Question Arising from California, Minnesota Laws," Educators Negotiating Service, 2 (September 4, 1967), pp. 3-4; and Rolland Denning, "Teacher Organizations and Desegregation," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIV (January 1968), pp. 257-260.

[36]The structure of the NEA reflects the authority of state legislatures with regard to education. Groups attempting to influence public policy tend to develop organizational structures similar to those bodies they desire to influence. Centralized governmental units seem to produce centralized interest groups and decentralized governmental units seem to produce decentralized interest groups. Cf. Harry Eckstein, Pressure Group Politics: The Case of the British Medical Association (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960), p. 21.

[37]Cf. Corinne Lathrop Gilb, Hidden Hierarchies: The Professions and Government (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966), pp. 128-130.

[38]Cf. David B. Truman, The Governmental Process (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951), pp. 129-139 and 167-187; Alvin Gouldner, "Metaphysical Pathos and the Theory of Bureaucracy," American Political Science Review, 49(June, 1955), pp. 505-506, and Harmon Zeigler, The Political Life of the High School Teacher (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1966), pp. 82-90.

TABLE 1

Composition of the Representative Assembly

Year	Percentage of Delegates Belonging to Each Occupational Category: Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Clearly Identified Teachers in Parentheses)		State Teacher Organization Officials	Unknown and Other	N
1959	25	70	(68)	3	2	5095
1964*	22	73	(69)	4	1	6171
1969	15	79	(74)	5	1	6914

* For 1965, the Department of Classroom Teachers Bulletin reported that 70% of Assembly delegates were classroom teachers; 22.5% were superintendents, principals and other administrators; 4% were retired teachers, 3% were staff members of state education associations, and 4% were "other". Occupational definitions may have varied slightly from those of this study.

TABLE 2

Composition of Board of Directors

Year	Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Teachers in Parentheses)		Teacher Organization Officials	Total
1964-65	46	35	(33)	5	86
1965-66	45	40	(37)	5	90
1966-67*	48	35	(31)	9	92
1967-68	49	40	(33)	6	95
1968-69	39	47	(39)	8	94
1969-70	32	59	(50)	4	95

* T. M. Stinnett, Turmoil in Teaching (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), p. 219, reported 37 teachers, 40 administrators, and 6 teacher organization officials. He evidently omitted ex officio members, and he did not define his occupational categorization.

TABLE 3

Composition of Executive Committee

Year	Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Teachers in Parentheses)		Teacher Organization Officials	Total
1959-60	6	4	(4)	1	11
1960-61	6	4	(4)	1	11
1961-62	6	3	(3)	2	11
1962-63	6	3	(3)	2	11
1963-64	7	2	(2)	1	11
1964-65	6	4	(4)	1	11
1965-66	5	6	(6)	0	11
1966-67*	5	5	(5)	1	11
1967-68	4	7	(7)	0	11
1968-69	2	8	(8)	0	10
1969-70	3	6	(5)	0	9

* Stinnett, Turmoil in Teaching, p. 219, reports for 1966-67, 7 teachers, two superintendents, and two principals. According to the NEA Handbook, 1966-1967 and the NEA Addressess and Proceedings, 1967, supplemented by previous Handbooks, there were on the committee five teachers, two deans of schools of education (one, the Association President and the other the Association Treasurer), one high school principal (the Association Vice-President), one superintendent, and one superintendent emeritus.

TABLE 4

Composition of Board of Trustees

Year	Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Teachers in Parentheses)	Teacher Organization Officials	Total
1959-60	4	0	1	5
1960-61	4	1 (1)	0	5
1961-62	4	1 (1)	0	5
1962-63	4	1* (0)	0	5
1963-64	3	1* (0)	1	5
1964-65	2	3* (2)	0	5
1965-66	2	3* (2)	0	5
1966-67	3	2 (2)	0	5
1967-68	2	2 (2)	0	5
1968-69	2	3 (3)	0	5

* Cloyd Miller, a consultant, had been a college president.

TABLE 5

Composition of National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards

Year	Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Teachers in Parentheses)		Teacher Organization Officials	Other	Total
1959-60	6	2	(2)	1	0	9
1960-61	5	3	(3)	1	0	9
1961-62	5	2	(2)	2	0	9
1962-63	6	2	(2)	1	0	9
1963-64	5	3	(3)	1	0	9
1964-65	4	4	(4)	1	0	9
1965-66	5	4	(4)	0	0	9
1966-67	4	5	(4)	0	0	9
1967-68	4	4	(3)	0	1	9
1968-69	3	5	(4)	0	1	9
1969-70	1	8	(2)	0	0	9

TABLE 6

Composition of Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities

Year	Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Teachers in Parentheses)		Teacher Organization Officials	Total
1961-62	5	8	(7)	0	13
1962-63	5	7	(6)	1	13
1963-64	3	8	(6)	2	13
1964-65	4	8	(7)	1	12
1965-66	5	7	(6)	1	13
1966-67	6	7	(7)	0	13
1967-68	3	10	(10)	0	13
1968-69	1	11	(11)	0	13
1969-70	2	10	(10)	1	13

TABLE 7

Composition of Legislative Commission

Year	Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Teachers in Parentheses)	Teacher Organization Officials	Total
1959-60	6	2 (2)	2	10
1960-61	5	2 (2)	2	9
1961-62	5	2 (2)	2	9
1962-63	5	2 (2)	2	9
1963-64	6	2 (2)	3	11
1964-65	6	2 (2)	3	11
1965-66	4	3 (1)	4	11
1966-67	4	4 (2)	3	11
1967-68	4	5 (3)	2	11
1968-69	2	6 (4)	2	10
1969-70	2	7 (6)	2	11

TABLE 8

Composition of Committee on Professional Ethics

Year	Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Teachers in Parentheses)	Teacher Organization Officials	Total
1959-60	1	4 (3)	0	5
1960-61	2	3 (2)	0	5
1961-62	1	3 (3)	1	5
1962-63	2	2 (2)	1	5
1963-64	1	3 (3)	1	5
1964-65	1	3 (3)	1	5
1965-66	0	3 (3)	2	5
1966-67	1	3 (3)	1	5
1967-68	2	2 (2)	1	5
1968-69	1	3 (2)	1	5
1969-70	1	3 (2)	1	5

TABLE 9

Composition of Committee on Educational Finance

Year	Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Teachers in Parentheses)		Teacher Organization Officials	Total
1959-60	3	1	(1)	1	5
1960-61	2	1	(1)	2	5
1961-62	2	2	(2)	1	5
1962-63	2	2	(2)	1	5
1963-64	2	2	(2)	1	5
1964-65	3	1	(1)	1	5
1965-66	3	1	(1)	1	
1966-67	2	2	(2)	0	4
1967-68	2	2	(2)	1	5
1968-69	2	2	(2)	0	4
1969-70	2	2	(2)	1	5

TABLE 10

Composition of the Citizenship Committee

Year	Administrators	Non-Administrative Staff (Teachers in Parentheses)		Teacher Organization Officials	Unknown	Total
1959-60	1	2	(2)	0	2	5
1960-61	1	3	(3)	0	1	5
1961-62	1	4	(4)	0	0	5
1962-63	2	2	(2)	1	0	5
1963-64	2	2	(2)	1	0	5
1964-65	2	2	(2)	1	0	5
1965-66	1	4	(4)	0	0	5
1966-67	2	3	(2)	0	0	5
1967-68	1	4	(3)	0	0	5
1968-69	1	4	(4)	0	0	5
1969-70	1	4	(4)	0	0	5